

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

KIRK MACKEY,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.)	
)	Case No. 4:24-CV-02533
VIET LONG, CORP.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, KIRK MACKEY, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendant’s failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff, KIRK MACKEY (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. In addition to being a customer of the public accommodation on the Property, Plaintiff is also an independent advocate for the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to demonstrate the plausibility of Plaintiff returning to the Property once the barriers to access identified in this Complaint are removed in order to strengthen the already existing standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property. (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP. (hereinafter “VIET LONG, CORP.”), is a Texas corporation that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., may be properly served with process for service via its Registered Agent, to wit: c/o Kevin Chien Nguyen, Registered Agent, 537 W. Fork, Webster, TX 77598.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

9. On or about May 15, 2024, Plaintiff intended to be a customer at “LA Cajun Crawfish,” a restaurant located at 13588 State Hwy. 249, Houston, TX 77086, referenced herein as “LA Cajun Crawfish”. Attached is a receipt documenting Plaintiff’s purchase. *See* Exhibit 1. Also attached is a photograph documenting Plaintiff’s visit to the Property. *See* Exhibit 2.

10. Plaintiff also intended to be a customer of Taqueria El Rodeo De Jalisco, a Mexican Restaurant located in an out-parcel building on the Property, but was dissuaded from

even attempting to enter the restaurant as a customer due to the barriers to access which prevented entry into the restaurant.

11. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that LA Cajun Crawfish is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

12. Plaintiff lives only 7 miles from the Property.

13. Given the close vicinity of the Property to Plaintiff’s residence, Plaintiff is routinely travelling by the Property.

14. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located 13588 State Hwy. 249, Houston, TX 77086, Harris County Property Appraiser’s property identification number: 1149730010001 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., is compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

15. There are 186 marked parking spaces on the Property.

16. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., as property owner, is responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP. and the tenant allocating responsibilities for ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant’s independent requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See* 28 CFR § 36.201(b).

17. Plaintiff has visited the Property once before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and for Advocacy Purposes.

18. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a return customer living in the near vicinity as well as for Advocacy Purposes but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

19. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Property.

20. Although Plaintiff did not personally encounter each and every barrier to access identified in Plaintiff's Complaint, Plaintiff became aware of all identified barriers prior to filing the Complaint and because Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property as a customer and advocate for the disabled within six months or sooner after the barriers to access are removed, it is likely that despite not actually encountering a particular barrier to access on one visit, Plaintiff may encounter a different barrier to access identified in the complaint in a subsequent visit as, for example, one accessible parking space may not be available and he would need to use an alternative accessible parking space in the future on his subsequent visit. As such, all barriers to access identified in the Complaint must be removed in order to ensure Plaintiff will not be

exposed to barriers to access and legally protected injury.

21. Plaintiff's inability to fully access the Property and the stores within in a safe manner and in a manner which inhibits the free and equal enjoyment of the goods and services offered at the Property, both now and into the foreseeable future, constitutes an injury in fact as recognized by Congress and is historically viewed by Federal Courts as an injury in fact.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

22. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

23. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

24. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

* * * * *

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

25. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

26. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

27. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

28. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

29. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

30. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

31. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

32. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

33. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., has discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

34. Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., is compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with

disabilities.

35. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- i. In front of Religion Nail Supply, there are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- ii. In front of Religion Nail Supply, the access aisle to the two accessible parking spaces is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- iii. In front of Religion Nail Supply, the accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.

- iv. In front of Religion Nail Supply, the two accessible parking spaces are not level due to the presence of accessible ramp side flares in the accessible parking spaces in violation of Sections 502.4 and 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle.
- v. In front of Louisiana Cajun Crawfish, there are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- vi. In front of Louisiana Cajun Crawfish, due to a failure to enact a policy of proper parking lot maintenance, there is a large divot in the access aisle servicing the two accessible parking spaces. As a result, the ground surfaces of the access aisle have vertical rises in excess of $\frac{1}{4}$ (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Sections 502.4, 302 and 303 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- vii. In front of Louisiana Cajun Crawfish, there are vertical rises along the surfaces of the accessible ramp that are in excess of a $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch, in violation of Sections 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access

public features of the Property when using this accessible ramp as vertical rises on ramps are particularly dangerous as the surface of the ramp is already at a significant slope which increases the likelihood of the wheelchair to tip over due to the vertical rise.

- viii. On the eastern side of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco, across the very active vehicular way/drive thru, are two accessible parking spaces that are not located on the shortest distance to an accessible route as the entrance which is open to the public is on the south side of the building and there is no continuous accessible route leading from the two accessible parking spaces to the main entrances on the south side of the building, this is a violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards.
- ix. On the south side of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco, are two entrance doors, both entrance doors on the south side have ramps directly in front of each door, as such, the maneuvering clearance of the accessible entrances are not level in violation of Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access this unit of the Property since it is often necessary for individuals in wheelchairs to need to use their hands to both wheel through the doorway and keep the door open with another hand. When the maneuvering clearance is not level, this ordinarily difficult process is made even more difficult by the presence of an excessive vertical rise.
- x. On the eastern side of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco, there is a door that may provide an entrance to the interior of the restaurant, but it is locked and there

is no signage, door-bell or other indication of a policy facilitating entry into the restaurant from this location. Moreover, there is not 54 inches of clearance as required in Section 404.2.4.1(e) of the 2010 ADAAG standards. Given the above barriers to access, the doorway on the eastern side of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco is not accessible.

- xi. On the southeastern corner of the building containing Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco, there is a palm tree which obstructs the entire exterior accessible route, as a result, there are publicly accessible areas of the Property having accessible routes with clear widths below the minimum 36 (thirty-six) inch requirement as required by Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access entry into Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco as Plaintiff's wheelchair would not be able to get past this barrier.
- xii. Along the southern side of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco, due to ramps in the accessible route leading to the entry doors, the accessible route has a cross-slope in excess of 1:48 in violation of Section 403.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because excessive cross-slope along accessible routes increases the likelihood of Plaintiff's wheelchair tipping over on its side and injuring Plaintiff.
- xiii. As a result of the barriers to access identified in (ix-xii), the Property lacks an accessible route connecting the exterior of the Property to all accessible elements and features inside Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco in violation of

Section 206.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco due to the lack of a safe accessible route leading from the exterior to the interior of Taqueria El Rodea De Jalisco

- xiv. On the Southwestern side of the Property are two accessible parking spaces missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- xv. On the southwestern side of the Property are two accessible parking spaces, due to a failure to enact a policy of proper parking lot maintenance, the ground surfaces of the accessible space has vertical rises in excess of $\frac{1}{4}$ (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Section 502.4, 302 and 303 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, as there are copious amounts of debris strewn over these accessible parking spaces. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- xvi. On the southwestern side of the Property the two accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property from these accessible parking spaces as the far location increases the likelihood of traversing into the vehicular way and getting struck by a vehicle or encountering a barrier to

access which stops Plaintiff from accessing the public accommodations offered at the Property.

- xvii. On the accessible route leading from the accessible parking spaces to the entrance to Ace Cash Express is a ramp, this ramp has vertical rises at the base of the accessible ramp as well as the ramp run that is in excess of a $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch, in violation of Section 303.2 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property when using this accessible ramp as vertical rises on ramps are particularly dangerous as the surface of the ramp is already at a significant slope which increases the likelihood of the wheelchair to tip over due to the vertical rise.
- xviii. For the accessible entrance to ACE Cash Express, the maneuvering clearance of this accessible entrance is not level (surface slope in excess of 1:48) in violation of Section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access this unit of the Property since it is often necessary for individuals in wheelchairs to need to use their hands to both wheel through the doorway and keep the door open with another hand. When the maneuvering clearance is not level, this ordinarily difficult process is made even more difficult by the inappropriately higher slope.
- xix. Inside Louisiana Cajun Crawfish, there are sales and services counters lacking any portion of the counter that has a maximum height of 36 (thirty-six) inches from the finished floor in violation of Section 904.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, all portions of the sales and service counter exceed 36 (thirty-six)

inches in height from the finished floor. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly transact business at the Property as Plaintiff is in a wheelchair which makes his height much lower than a standing individual, so a surface with a maximum height of 36 inches above the finished floor is necessary for Plaintiff to sign credit card receipts.

- xx. Inside Louisiana Cajun Crawfish, there is a policy of placing boxes and other items in the hallway leading to the restrooms. As a result, the interior has walking surfaces lacking a 36 (thirty-six) inch clear width, in violation of Section 403.5.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly utilize public features at the Property because the width of Plaintiff's wheelchair would prevent passage through areas with a width less than 36 inches.
- xxi. As a result of the barrier to access referenced in (xx), the Property lacks an accessible route connecting the exterior of the Property to all accessible elements and features inside Louisiana Cajun Crawfish in violation of Section 206.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property due to the lack of a safe accessible route leading from the exterior to interior spaces inside the Property.
- xxii. Defendant fails to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

LOUISIANA CAJUN CRAWFISH RESTROOMS

- xxiii. The restroom lacks signage in compliance with Sections 216.8 and 703 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to locate accessible restroom facilities.
- xxiv. Restrooms have a vanity sink with inadequate knee and toe clearance in violation of Section 306 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom sink as Plaintiff is seated in a wheelchair and, when seated, Plaintiff's feet and legs protrude out in front. In order to properly utilize a sink, Plaintiff's legs must be able to be underneath the surface of the sink, but due to the improper configuration of the sink, there is no room underneath for Plaintiff's legs and feet.
- xxv. The restroom door, when exiting, lacks a clear minimum maneuvering clearance, due to the proximity of the door hardware within 18 inches to the adjacent sink, in violation of Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom due to the fact individuals in wheelchairs have their feet sticking out in front of them and when there is inadequate clearance near the door (less than 18 inches), their protruding feet block their ability to reach the door hardware to open the door.
- xxvi. The actionable mechanism of the paper towel dispenser in the restroom is located outside the maximum prescribed vertical reach range of 48 inches above the finished floor as set forth in Section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG

standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to reach the actionable mechanism of the paper towel dispenser as individuals in wheelchairs are seated and have significantly less reach range than individuals who stand up.

xxvii. The soap dispenser in the restroom is located higher than 48 inches above the finished floor which is outside the prescribed vertical reach ranges set forth in Section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to reach the actionable mechanism of the soap dispenser as individuals in wheelchairs are seated and have significantly less reach range than individuals who stand up.

xxviii. The door hardware of the bathroom stalls lacks proper hardware on both sides in violation of Section 309.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to utilize the restroom facilities.

xxix. The accessible toilet stall door is not self-closing and violates Section 604.8.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for the Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely and privately utilize the restroom facilities.

xxx. The accessible toilet stall door swings into the clear floor space required by the stall and violates Section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for the Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

xxxi. The hand operated flush control is not located on the open side of the

accessible toilet in violation of Section 604.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to flush the toilet as the location of the flush control on the open side is significantly easier to reach than when it is positioned on the closed side.

xxxii. The toilet paper dispenser in the accessible toilet is not positioned seven to nine inches in front of the toilet and therefore is in violation of Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to utilize the toilet due to the fact the toilet paper dispenser is at an improper distance from the toilet, given Plaintiff's disability, Plaintiff would not be able to get up and reach the toilet paper.

xxxiii. The size of the restroom stall is smaller than 60-inches in width and/or 56-inches in depth. As a result, the restroom lacks a toilet compartment compliant with Section 604.8.1 due to the lack of adequate size. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

36. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

37. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

38. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

39. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to the Property into compliance with the ADA.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

41. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., has the financial resources to make the necessary modifications. According to the Property Appraiser, the collective Appraised value of the Property is \$3,598,780.00.

42. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendant has available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction from the IRS for spending money on accessibility modifications.

43. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property has been altered since 2010.

44. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

45. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., is required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

46. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

47. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP.

48. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

49. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP., from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendant, VIET LONG, CORP. to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and

- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: July 3, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro

Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.

Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479

The Schapiro Law Group, P.L

7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A

Boca Raton, FL 33433

Tel: (561) 807-7388

Email: schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com